

Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04527 01 OF 05 311739 Z

47

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 TRSE-00 CIAE-00 EUR-25 PM-07 INR-10

L-03 NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01

USIA-12 SAJ-01 IO-13 OIC-04 AEC-11 ACDA-19 OMB-01

H-02 NSC-10 SS-15 RSR-01 /154 W
----- 089466

P R 311523 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9052

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 525

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

RUCBSAA USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 5 VIENNA 4527

DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

E. O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM MBFR

SUBJECT: DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET AND CZECHOSLOVAKIAN REPS

MAY 30, 1973

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: UK AND US REPS MET FOR FURTHER DISCUSSION OF COMMUNIQUE TEXT WITH SOVIET AND CZECH REPS AFTERNOON OF MAY 30. A CERTAIN AMOUNT OF PROGRESS WAS MADE FROM TEXT DEVELOPED MAY 29 IN LANGUAGE REFLECTING CONCEPT OF PHASING AND COMPLEXITY OF NEGOTIATIONS, AND ON RIGHT OF DIRECT PARTICIPANTS TO RAISE TOPICS FOR NEGOTIATION. THESE DRAFTING IMPROVEMENTS REMAIN IN EASTERN BRACKETS PENDING EASTERN CONSIDERATION. EAST REPLIED TO STRONG SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04527 01 OF 05 311739 Z

ALLIED EMPHASIS ON NEED FOR FIRM DATE BY REPEATING EVANSION TACTICS OF PREVIOUS SESSION. EASTERN REPS ALSO CONTINUED STRONGLY TO OPPOSE INCLUSION OF WORD "BALANCED" IN THE TEXT. MAIN CHANGE IN TEXT WAS IN PARAGRAPH COVERING THE CONCEPT OF THE STEP BY STEP

APPROACH, REPLACING EARLIER FORMULATION WHICH BEGAN, " IN VIEW OF THE COMPLEXITY OF THE SUBJECT MATTER, ETC...." PROPOSED SENTENCE NOW READS: " IT WAS AGREED THAT, IN THE NEGOTIATIONS, AN UNDERSTANDING SHOULD BE REACHED TO CONDUCT THEM IN SUCH A WAY AS TO ENSURE THAT MOST EFFECTIVE AND THOROUGH APPROACH TO THE CONSIDERATION OF THE SUBJECT MATTER, WITH DUE REGARD TO ITS COMPLEXITY". A FURTHER WORKING SESSION WITH SAME PARTICIPANTS WILL BE HELD AFTERNOON OF MAY 31. END SUMMARY.

2. UK AND US REPS PARTICIPATED IN MAY 30 SESSION, WITH SOVIET REPS KHESTOV, MOVCHAN, AND TIMERBAYEV AND CZECH REPS LAHODA AND KLENIN PARTICIPATING FOR THE EAST. UK REP OPENED DISCUSSION BY SAYING THAT SOVIET VERSION OF DRAFT DEVELOPED IN MAY 29 SESSION WHICH HAD BEEN CIRCULATED BY SOVIETS EARLIER THAT DAY VIOLATED CLEAR UNDERSTANDING THAT THE ORDER OF THOSE SENTENCES FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH 2 WAS RANDOM AND WOULD BE ESTABLISHED BY AGREEMENT LATER. KHESTOV REPLIED THAT THE ORDERING OF SENTENCES IN THE THIRD PARAGRAPH OF THE SOVIET TEXT REPRESENTED THE WAY THE EAST WOULD LIKE TO SEE IT, BUT HE AGREED THAT THERE HAD BEEN NO AGREEMENT ON ORDERING.

3. THE UK REP SAID THAT, APART FROM THE QUESTION OF ORDER, THE DRAFTING RECORDS OF THE SOVIETS AND THE ALLIED REPS WERE LARGELY IN CONFORMITY. HE PROPOSED THAT DISCUSSION FOCUS ON THE ALLIED DRAFT TEXT AND THAT OPEN ISSUES BE DEALT WITH IN THE SAME ORDER THAT THE FOOTNOTES APPEARED IN THAT TEXT.

4. TURNING TO THE FIRST OPEN QUESTION IN PARA 1 OF THE DRAFT COMMUNIQUE ON WHETHER OR NOT TO APPEND THE RECORD OF THE MAY 14 PLENARY ON PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES TO THE COMMUNIQUE TEXT, THE UK REP SAID HE UNDERSTOOD THAT THE SOVIETS WOULD PREFER NOT TO APPEND THIS RECORD, BUT THAT THE ALLIES, ON THE OTHER HAND, WOULD LIKE TO ASSURE THAT THE COMMUNIQUE WOULD NOT BE CONSIDERED TO SUPERSEDE ANY ASPECTS OF THE MAY 14 AGREEMENT, FOR THIS REASON, THEY WOULD PREFER THAT IT BE APPENDED TO THE COMMUNIQUE. HOWEVER, THIS CONCERN COULD BE EASED AND THE INTEREST OF ALL SERVED IF
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04527 01 OF 05 311739 Z

THE SENTENCE OF THE DRAFT TEXT DEALING WITH THE QUESTION OF RAISING TOPICS FOR NEGOTIATIONS BY DIRECT PARTICIPANTS COULD BE AMENDED TO SHOW THAT THERE WAS NO INTENTION IN IT TO MODIFY THE MAY 14 RECORD AS CONCERNED THE RIGHT TO SPEAK OF ALL PARTICIPANTS. THUS, THIS SECTION MIGHT READ, " IT WAS (ALSO) DECIDED THAT IN THE COURSE OF THE NEGOTIATIONS, ANY TOPIC RELEVANT TO THE SUBJECT MATTER MAY BE INTRODUCED FOR NEGOTIATIONS BY ANY OF THOSE STATES WHICH WILL TAKE THE NECESSARY DECISIONS. THIS IS WITHOUT PREJUDICE TO THE RIGHT OF ALL PARTICIPANTS TO SPEAK AND CIRCULATE PAPERS ON THE SUBJECT MATTER. " UK REP SAID IT WAS HOPED THIS WOULD EASE THE PROBLEM THE SOVIETS HAD BEEN HAVING WITH THIS CONCEPT.

5. KHESTOV SAID HE WAS WILLING TO CONSIDER THIS PROPOSAL, BUT WOULD TENTATIVELY HAVE TO PLACE IT IN BRACKETS PENDING A CHANCE TO DISCUSS IT FURTHER WITH HIS EASTERN COLLEAGUES. UK REP SAID THAT ACCORDINGLY, THE QUESTION OF APPENDING THE MAY 14 PACKAGE ON PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES TO THE COMMUNIQUE WOULD ALSO REMAIN AN OPEN ONE.

6. THE UK REP TURNED TO THE SECOND OPEN QUESTION IN THE COMMUNIQUE TEXT, THE PHRASE IN APR 2 " MUTUAL REDUCTION OF FORCES AND ARMAMENTS AND ASSOCIATED MEASURES." HE ASKED IF THE EASTERN REPS HAD HAD A CHANCE TO CONSIDER THIS WORDING AND IF THEY WERE PREPARED TO DROP THEIR BRACKETS. KHESTOV REPLIED THAT THE EASTERN SIDE WAS STILL CONSULTING ON THE QUESTION, AND IT WOULD STILL HAVE TO REMAIN BRACKETED. THE UK REP SAID THAT, AS A GRAMMATICAL POINT, IT WOULD BE PREFERABLE FOR THE PHRASE TO READ " NEGOTIATIONS ON MUTUAL REDUCTION OF FORCES AND ARMAMENTS AND ON ASSOCIATED MEASURES." KHESTOV REACTED BY SAYING THAT THE ALLIED REPS WERE OVERLOADING THE BOAT. ALLIED REPS SAID THAT THEY WERE NOT PRESSING THIS POINT ON THE EAST, BUT SIMPLY RAISING IT AS A POINT OF GRAMMAR AND DICTION.

7. THE UK REP THEN TURNED TO THE THIRD OPEN QUESTION, THE ISSUE OF DATE TO BE INSERTED IN PARAGRAPH 2. HE SAID IT WOULD NOT BE SUFFICIENT FOR BOTH SIDES MERELY TO REPEAT WHAT THEY HAD EARLIER SAID ON THE QUESTION OF DATE. EARLIER, THE ALLIED REPS HAD ACCOMMODATED THE EAST BY AGREEING FOR ONE INITIAL DISCUSSION TO LEAVE THE QUESTION OF DATE ASIDE. NOW THEY HAD TO RAISE THE DATE QUESTION WHICH AS CRUCIAL PART OF THE WHOLE PACKAGE.

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 04527 01 OF 05 311739 Z

THE ALLIED REPS HAD HEARD NOTHING FROM THE EAST ABOUT THE QUESTION OF DATE EXCEPT THAT THE EASTERN SIDE DID NOT WANT TO TALK ABOUT IT. BUT TIME WAS PASSING AND BOTH SIDES WERE WORKING ON THE REMAINING PARTS OF THE PACKAGE EMBODIED IN THE COMMUNIQUE. A MAJOR PART OF THIS PACKAGE, THE DATE, COULD NOT BE LEFT ASIDE. THE ALLIED REPS HAD PROPOSED OCTOBER 30 AS A DATE. THEY COULD HAVE PROPOSED AN EARLIER DATE, BUT HAD SOUGHT TO ACCOMMODATE THE EAST WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF THE TIME TABLE WHICH HAD BEEN AGREED AT A HIGH LEVEL AND WHICH CONSISTED OF THE PERIOD SEPTEMBER/OCTOBER. THE ALLIES ASSUME THAT THIS TIME FRAME WILL BE ADHERED TO. IF THE EAST WERE NOT WILLING TO BE FORTHCOMING ON THIS POINT, THIS WOULD THROW OPEN THE WHOLE QUESTION OF A COMMUNIQUE AND THE WHOLE PROCESS OF PREPARATORY TALKS. THE UK REP THEN REMINDED THE EASTERN REPS THAT THE SOVIET NOTE OF SEPTEMBER 12, 1972, SAID AS ITS FOURTH POINT THAT A CONFERENCE ON THE PROBLEMS OF REDUCING ARMED FORCES AND

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04527 02 OF 05 311753 Z

41

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 RSR-01 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAI-01 IO-13 OIC-04 AEC-11

AECE-00 ACDA-19 OMB-01 /154 W
----- 089585

P R 311523 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9053

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 526

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

RUCBSAA USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 5 VIENNA 4527

DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

ARMAMENTS IN EUROPE WILL START IN SEPTEMBER OR OCTOBER OF 1973. THE AGREEMENT ON THIS TIMEFRAME HAD BEEN CENTRAL TO THE ALLIED APPROACH TO THE PREPARATORY CONSULTATIONS. THE MOMENT HAD COME TO ADHERE TO IT. THE UK REP SAID THAT HE ASSUMED THE EASTERN SIDE WOULD ACCEPT THIS TIME FRAME, SINCE OTHERWISE IT WOULD BE A REVERSAL OF A HIGH LEVEL AGREEMENT, IF NOT, HE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHY THE EAST COULD NOT ACCEPT.

8. KHESTOV SAID THAT HE COULD ONLY REPEAT WHAT HE HAD SAID EARLIER -- THAT IN THE SOVIET VIEW, THE FOCUS OF PRESENT WORK WAS ON AGENDA, COMMUNIQUE, THE ORDER OF VARIOUS ITEMS IN THE COMMUNIQUE, AND A DESCRIPTION FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS, AND THAT THESE
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04527 02 OF 05 311753 Z

SUBJECTS HAD TO BE AGREED BEFORE IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO GO ON TO QUESTION OF TIME AND PLACE FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS. IN KEEPING WITH THIS UNDERSTANDING, HE SUGGESTED THAT THE DISCUSSION GO ON TO OTHER ASPECTS OF THE DRAFT UNDER DISCUSSION.

9. THE UK REP SAID THAT THERE HAD BEEN NO UNDERSTANDING WHATEVER THAT THE QUESTIONS OF AGENDA, DESCRIPTION, ORDERING OF ITEMS, ETC., HAD TO BE FINISHED BEFORE DISCUSSION COULD TURN TO THE QUESTION OF TIME AND PLACE. ON THE CONTRARY, FOR THE ALLIES ALL

OF THE ASPECTS COVERED IN THE COMMUNIQUE WERE PARTS OF THE SAME PACKAGE. KHESTOV'S IDEA OF FINISHING CERTAIN PARTS OF THE COMMUNIQUE FIRST BEFORE GETTING TO THE QUESTION OF DATE RAISED THE PROSPECT OF AN INDEFINITE PROCESS OF DISCUSSION WHICH COULD BE ACHIEVED BY DRAGGING OUT DISCUSSION OF, SAY, AGENDA. FURTHER, THE EAST SHOULD UNDERSTAND THAT THE ALLIED ARGUMENT ON THE NEED FOR A FIRM DATE FOR NEGOTIATIONS WAS A POLITICAL ONE. THE PARTICIPANTS IN THE PRESENT CONSULTATIONS WERE NEAR THE END OF THEIR DELIBERATIONS. THE QUESTION OF A DATE WAS CRUCIAL. THE ALLIES HAD MADE A SPECIFIC PROPOSAL. THE EAST, BY REFUSING TO RESPOND AND BY SEEKING TO ELIMINATE WORDS LIKE "AUTUMN" IN EARLIER DRAFTING DISCUSSIONS, DID NOT INSPIRE CONFIDENCE.

10. KHESTOV SAID THERE WAS A DISTINCTION BETWEEN PROCEDURAL AND SUBSTANTIVE QUESTIONS. THE ALLIES WANTED TO RAISE A SUBSTANTIVE QUESTION FIRST. THE EAST, IN KEEPING WITH GOOD JURIDICAL TRADITION, WISHED TO GO STEP BY STEP ON A PROCEDURAL BASIS. IN THE EASTERN VIEW, FIRST QUESTIONS HAD TO BE DECIDED FIRST AND WORK HAD TO BE DONE IN AN ORDERLY FASHION. AT THIS POINT THE DISCUSSION WERE FOCUSING ON THE THIRD POINT, I. E., AGENDA. EARLIER, THE PARTICIPANTS HAD WORDED ON PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES. STARTING FROM 17 OF MAY, HOWEVER, THEY HAD FOCUSED ON THE SUBJECT OF THE AGENDA. THERE HAD EVEN BEEN UNOFFICIAL GROUPS THAT HAD BEEN WORKING ON THIS SUBJECT. THUS, THE CORRECT FOCUS OF EFFORT WAS ON AGENDA RELATED SUBJECTS.

11. THE UK REP SAID THAT HE COULD SEE THAT THE EASTERN SIDE WAS NOT READY TO GIVE A FORTHCOMING REPLY ON THE QUESTION OF DATE. HE WISHED TO EMPHASIZE THAT IT WAS A CRUCIAL QUESTION AND THAT THE ALLIES CONSIDERED THAT THEY WERE WORKING ON A SINGLE PACKAGE OF WHICH QUESTION OF DATE WAS AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT, AND ONE WHICH COULD AFFECT OTHER PARTS. THE ALLIED REPS COULD AGREE

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04527 02 OF 05 311753 Z

TO PROCEED WITH FURTHER DISCUSSIONS WITHOUT FURTHER ELABORATION DURING THIS SESSION ON THE QUESTION OF DATE, BUT WITH THE UNDERSTANDING THAT THE ASPECTS OF A COMMUNIQUE, INCLUDING DATE, WERE PARTS OF A PACKAGE. US REP NOTED THAT THE UK REP WAS SPEAKING ON BEHALF OF ALL OF THE ALLIES AND THAT HE COULD NOT SEE HOW IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO ISSUE A COMMUNIQUE WHICH SHOULD BE DONE IN THE NEXT DAYS, WITHOUT A DATE.

12. UK REP TURNED TO THE FOURTH FOOTNOTE INDICATING AN OPEN ISSUE IN THE TEXT, THE QUESTION OF THE ORDER OF SENTENCES IN PARAGRAPH 2. HE SAID THAT WHILE IT WAS NOT NECESSARY TO GO INTO THIS QUESTION AT THE MOMENT, THE EAST SHOULD BEAR IN MIND THAT THIS QUESTION OF ORDER WAS AN IMPORTANT ONE AND THAT THE ALLIES DID NOT ACCEPT THE EASTERN PREFERENCE FOR ORDER AS EXPRESSED IN THEIR CURRENT VERSION OF THE TEXT.

13. THE UK REP TURNED TO THE FIFTH FOOTNOTE OF THE TEXT AS DEVELOPED MAY 29, REFERRING TO THE SE

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04527 03 OF 05 311817 Z

41

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 CIAE-00 EUR-25 PM-07 INR-10 L-03 NEA-10

NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01 USIA-12 TRSE-00

SAJ-01 H-02 NSC-10 SS-15 IO-13 OIC-04 AEC-11 ACDA-19

OMB-01 AECE-00 RSR-01 /154 W

----- 089767

P R 311523 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9054

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 527

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

RUCBSAA USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 5 VIENNA 4527

DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

UNDERSTANDING SHOULD BE REACHED TO CONDUCT NEGOTIATIONS IN SUCH A WAY AS TO INSURE THE MOST EFFECTIVE AND THOROUGH APPROACH TO THE CONSIDERATION OF THE SUBJECT MATTER".

16. THE UK REP SAID THAT THIS WAS AN IMPROVEMENT OVER THE PREVIOUS EASTERN WORDING, BUT THAT A PHRASE SHOULD BE ADDED TO THE EASTERN SUGGESTION, " WITH THE CIRCUMSPECTION REQUIRED BY ITS COMPLEXITY." THE US REP SAID THAT, IF THE WORD : CIRCUMSPECTION" POSED PROBLEMS, PERHAPS " PRUDENCE" COULD BE SUBSTITUTED, OR THE PHRASE / WITH DUE REGARD TO ITS COMPLEXITY." THE UK REP THEN READ A MODIFIED VERSION OF THE SECOND SOVIET SUGGESTION: " IN THE NEGOTIATIONS, AN UNDERSTANDING SHOULD
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04527 03 OF 05 311817 Z

BE REACHED TO CONDUCT THEM IN SUCH A WAY AS TO ENSURE THE MOST EFFECTIVE AND THOROUGH APPROACH TO THE SUBJECT MATTER, AS REQUIRED BY ITS COMPLEXITY." TIMERBAYEV SAID THIS VERSION PLACED TOO MUCH EMPHASIS ON COMPLEXITY. LAHODA SECONDED THE POINT SAYING THAT IF SUCH PESSIMISTIC WORDING WERE USED, NO ONE WOULD BELIEVE

THAT THE NEGOTIATIONS WOULD MAKE ANY PROGRESS.

17. AFTER A BRIEF DISCUSSION, THE EASTERN REPS PROPOSED A THIRD VARIANT AS FOLLOWS: IT WAS AGREED THAT, IN THE NEGOTIATIONS, AN UNDERSTANDING SHOULD BE REACHED TO CONDUCT THEM IN SUCH A WAY AS TO ENSURE THE MOST EFFECTIVE AND THOROUGH APPROACH TO THE CONSIDERATION OF THE SUBJECT MATTER, WITH DUE REGARD TO ITS COMPLEXITY." THE ALLIED REPS SAID THEY WOULD TAKE THIS PHRASE UNDER CONSIDERATION AND DISCUSS IT WITH THEIR ALLIES, PLACING IT IN BRACKETS IN THE MEANWHILE.

18. THE UK REP THEN TURNED TO THE SENTENCE ON "BALANCE". "IT WAS ALSO AGREED THAT SPECIFIC (ARRANGEMENTS) WILL HAVE TO BE ... IN SUCH A WAY THAT THEY WILL ... BE TO THE DETRIMENT TO THE SECURITY OF ANY OF THE PARTIES." REFERRING TO FOOTNOTE 6 INDICATING PENDING QUESTIONS ON THE WORD "ARRANGEMENTS," THE UK REP SUGGESTED THAT THIS QUESTION REMAIN AN OPEN ONE, SINCE IT RELATED TO THE QUESTION OF A DESCRIPTION FOR THE TALKS. TURNING TO THE 7TH FOOTNOTE, WHICH REFERRED TO THE FIRST BLANK IN THE SENTENCE FOR WHICH THE ALLIES HAD PROPOSED THE WORD "BALANCED," UK REP SAID THE ALLIED POSITION REMAINED THE SAME AS IT WAS BEFORE, I. E., THAT THE ALLIED SIDE COULD CONSIDER A DESCRIPTION FOR THE TALKS WHICH DID NOT INCLUDE THE WORD "BALANCED" ONLY IF THIS WORD WERE INCLUDED ELSEWHERE IN THE TEXT. HE THEN EXPLAINED THAT, AS PROPOSED IN THE SENTENCE UNDER DISCUSSION, THE WORD "BALANCED" MEANT, IN EFFECT, UNDIMINISHED SECURITY. WOULD IT NOT BE POSSIBLE FOR THE EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES TO EXPLAIN TO THEIR AUTHORITIES THAT THIS WORD HAD POSITIVE ASPECTS? IT WAS NOT ESSENTIAL THAT THE WORD APPEAR IN THIS SPECIFIC SENTENCE; IT MIGHT GO ELSEWHERE IN THE TEXT OF THE COMMUNIQUE, ALTHOUGH THE SENTENCE UNDER DISCUSSION SEEMED TO BE THE MOST LOGICAL PLACE. IT WAS, HOWEVER, ESSENTIAL THAT THE WORD APPEAR SOMEWHERE. THIS WAS A POLITICAL REALITY BASED ON BROAD POLITICAL REASONS OF WHICH THE EASTERN SIDE WAS WELL AWARE. EARLIER, THE ALLIED REPS HAD SAID THAT THEY COULD CONSIDER GIVING UP THE TITLE "MBFR" ONLY IF TWO CONDITIONS WERE MET. ONE WAS THAT ARMED FORCE ACTIVITIES OTHER THAN REDUCTIONS
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04527 03 OF 05 311817 Z

WOULD BE COVERED IN A DESIGNATION FOR THE NEGOTIATIONS. THIS PURPOSE WAS SERVED BY THE WORDS "ASSOCIATED MEASURES" ON WHICH THERE WAS NOW TENTATIVE AGREEMENT. THE SECOND CONDITION WAS THAT THE WORD "BALANCED" APPEAR AT SOME POINT IN THE TEXT. THE ALLIED REPS HAD SHOWN THEIR WILLINGNESS TO MAKE A VERY IMPORTANT CONCESSION ON THIS SUBJECT. NOW IT WAS TIME FOR THE EAST TO MAKE A CONCESSION OF ITS OWN.

19. THE US REP SAID THAT, TO SUPPLEMENT THE REMARKS OF THE UK REP, IT SHOULD BE CLEARLY UNDERSTOOD THAT THE QUESTION OF THE WORD "BALANCED" REPRESENTED A POLITICAL DEAL. THE ALLIES WOULD DROP THIS WORD FROM THE DESIGNATION FOR THE TALKS IN RETURN FOR INCLUSION OF THE WORD ELSEWHERE IN THE TEXT. THUS, IT WOULD GO FROM A POSITION IN THE TITLE WHERE THE EASTERN

SIDE FELT THAT IT HAD SPECIFIC CONNOTATIONS WHICH ID DID NOT LIKE, TO ANOTHER PLACE IN THE TEXT WHERE THE CONNOTATIONS WOULD BE WHOLLY NEUTRAL. BUT INCLUSION OF THIS WORD WAS IMPORTANT TO THE ACCEPTABILITY OF THE ENTIRE COMMUNIQUE. US REP THEN URGED THE EASTERN REPS TO INFORM THEIR AUTHORITIES OF THIS POINT, AS WELL AS OF ALL THE ARGUMENTS RELATED TO THE SUBJECT THAT HAD BEEN MADE BY THE ALLIED REPS.

20. KHESTOV SAID THAT HE WOULD HAVE TO REPEAT HIS EARLIER REMARKS: TO INCLUDE THE WORD " BALANCED" IN THE COMMUNIQUE TEXT WAS OUT OF THE QUESTION, AND FURTHER DISCUSSION OF THE SUBJECT WAS UNPRODUCTIVE. THE EASTERN REPS WERE SIMPLY NOT IN A SITUATION WHERE THEY COULD AGREE TO INCLUSION OF THIS WORD. ON THE SUBJECT OF CONCESSIONS, HE WISHED TO NOTE THAT THE EASTERN SIDE HAD MET THE DESIRES OF THE ALLIED REPS BY WORKING ON PHRASING RELATED TO THE QUESTION OF GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. FROM THE EAST' S

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04527 04 OF 05 311851 Z

47

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 TRSE-00 CIAE-00 EUR-25 PM-07 INR-10

L-03 NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01

USIA-12 SAJ-01 IO-13 OIC-04 AEC-11 ACDA-19 OMB-01

H-02 NSC-10 SS-15 AECE-00 RSR-01 /154 W

----- 090073

P R 311523 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9055

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 528

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

RUCBSAA USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO

S E C R E T SECTION 4 OF 5 VIENNA 4527

DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

VIEWPOINT, THE GOAL OF THE NEGOTIATIONS WAS THE REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS. NONETHELESS, THE EASTERN REPS

HAD BEEN AUDACIOUS ENOUGH IN THE LIGHT OF THEIR INSTRUCTIONS TO COLLABORATE IN A STATEMENT OF GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE NEGOTIATIONS GOING BEYOND THIS. THEY WERE NOT AT ALL SURE HOW THIS STEP ON THEIR PART WOULD BE RECEIVED BY THEIR OWN AUTHORITIES. THUS, THE EASTERN REPS HAD TRIED TO TAKE ACCOUNT OF THE INTERESTS OF THE ALLIED REPS. HOWEVER, OR REASONS THEY HAD EXPLAINED EARLIER, THEY SIMPLY COULD NOT GO ALONG WITH THE INCLUSION OF THE WORD "BALANCED." THERE WAS A DEFINITE UNDERSTANDING ON THIS COMING FROM OUR AUTHORITIES, KHESTOV SAID. THE US REP ASKED KHESTOV TO ELABORATE. KHESTOV DID NOT, SAYING HE
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04527 04 OF 05 311851 Z

BELIEVED THAT THE ALLIED REPS UNDERSTOOD WHAT HE MEANT. ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT KHESTOV WAS REFERRING TO THE WORDING OF PREVIOUS EAST/ WEST BILATERAL COMMUNIQUE ON MBFR, THE US REP SAID THAT THE EAST SHOULD BEAR IN MIND THAT THE PRESENT PARTICIPANTS WERE GATHERED TOGETHER FOR A SPECIFIC PURPOSE DEALING DIRECTLY WITH THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS. FURTHER, HE SAID THAT THE EAST SHOULD NOTE CAREFULLY THAT A COMMUNIQUE WAS AN IMPORTANT PART OF THE PREPARATORY CONSULTATIONS AND THAT THE WORD "BALANCED" WAS IMPORTANT TO THE PROSPECTS OF COMMON AGREEMENT ON THE COMMUNIQUE. KHESTOV SAID THAT THE EASTERN REPS WOULD NOTE WHAT THE ALLIED REPS HAD SAID, BUT THAT THEIR VIEWPOINT REMAINED AS SET FORTH ALREADY.

21. THE US REP NOTED THAT THE DRAFT COMMUNIQUE TEXT PRESENTLY UNDER DISCUSSION DID NOT CONTAIN A DEFINITION OF THE WORD "BALANCED." IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO MAKE THE SENTENCE UNDER DISCUSSION MORE SPECIFIC BY INCLUDING A DEFINITION OF THIS WORD, THEREBY SERVING TO DISPEL SUSPICIONS AND PRECONCEPTIONS THAT MIGHT BE LINKED TO THIS WORD BY THE EAST. SUCH A DEFINITION COULD BE ALONG THE LINES OF EXPLAINING THAT BALANCED MEANS THAT THE SPECIFIC RESULTS OF THE NEGOTIATIONS WILL CONFORM WITH THE PRINCIPLE OF UNDIMINISHED SECURITY. THIS WAS A NEUTRAL AND OBJECTIVE DEFINITION FOR THE WORD "BALANCED". AT THE SAME TIME, THE US REP SAID, IF THE EAST DID NOT WISH TO ACCEPT SUCH AN OBJECTIVE ARGUMENT, THEY SHOULD BEAR IN MIND THE POLITICAL DYNAMICS EARLIER DESCRIBED BY THE ALLIED REPS AND THE WILLINGNESS OF THE ALLIED REPS TO CONSIDER DROPPING THE WORD "BALANCED" FROM THE DESIGNATION OF THE TALKS ONLY ON THE CONDITION THAT THIS WORD APPEAR ELSEWHERE IN THE TEXT OF THE COMMUNIQUE.

22. KHESTOV SAID HE COULD ONLY REPEAT THE EASTERN POSITION, WHICH BY THIS TIME AS WELL KNOWN TO THE ALLIED REPS. THUS, HE SUGGESTED THAT DISCUSSION TURN TO OTHER POINTS.

23. THE US REP SAID THAT DISCUSSION THUS FAR HAD INDICATED SOME PROGRESS. TWO CARDINAL POINTS HOWEVER REMAINED OPEN -- THE QUESTION OF DATE AND THE WORD "BALANCED." HE DID NOT SEE ANY WAY TO END THE PRESENT PHASE OF WORK UNTIL A SOLUTION WAS FOUND TO BOTH OF THESE QUESTIONS. KHESTOV SAID IN THIS CASE, HE

WOULD BE EVEN MORE PESSIMISTIC. THERE WERE OTHER POINTS
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04527 04 OF 05 311851 Z

UNRESOLVED BEYOND THE TWO MENTIONED BY THE US REP, FOREXAMPLE, THE QUESTION OF " ASSOCIATED MEASURES." NONETHELESS, HE SUGGESTED THAT WORK PROCEED TO OTHER ASPECTS OF THE COMMUNIQUE. US REP SAID THAT IF THE PHRASE " ASSOCIATED MEASURES" WEREPUT IN QUESTION BY EASTERN REPS, LATTER SHOULD REALIZE THAT ALLIES WOULD INSIST ON THEIR ORIGINAL MBFR DESIGNATION.

24. THE UK REP SAID THAT, IF WORK WENT ON TO OTHER POINTS, THE EASTERN REPS SHOULD HAVE NO DOUBTS THAT THE ALLIES WOULD RETURN TO TWO MAJOR POINTS MENTIONED BY THE US REP. HE FURTHER SAID THAT IT WAS ABOUT TIME FOR THE EASTERN SIDE TO SHOW SOME SIGNS OF FLEXIBILITY.

25. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE ALLIED REPS WER WONT TO REFER TO THEIR PROBLEMS. BUT THEY SHOULD REMEMBER THAT, IN THE EAST' S OPINION, THE ONLY GOAL OF THE NEGOTIATIONS WAS THE REDUCTION OF ARMED FORCES AND ARMAMENTS, WHEREAS THE ALLIED REPS HAD INSISTED THAT OTHER GOALS BE INTRODUCED SUCH AS " ASSOCIATED MEASURES," AS WELL AS SOME GENERAL OBJECTIVES OF THE NEGOTIATIONS. HE ASKED THE ALLIED REPS PLEASE TO NOTE THIS POINT.

26 US REP SAID THAT IF THE SOVIETS CONSIDERED A PURELY ORTHODOX MENTION OF THE TERM " OBJECTIVES" A DARING CONCESSION, THE ALLIES MIGHT CONSIDER DROPPING THE POINT IF THE EAST WOULD AGREE TO INCLUDING THE TERM " BALANCED." JHLESTOV SAID NO.

27. THE UK REP MOVEDON TO THE 8 TH FOOTNOTE, AGAIN ON THE SAME SENTENCE. HE NOTED THAT THE ALLIED REPS IN PREVIOUS DISCUSSION HAD PREFERRED THAT ARRANGEMENTS BE DESCRIBED AS BEING BALANCED IN SUCH A WAY THAT THEY WILL " AT NO POINT" BE DETRIMENTAL TO THE SECURITY OF ANY OF THE PARTIES. THE EASTERNREPS HAD PREFERRED THE PHRASES " IN NO CASE" OR " IN NO WAY OR MANNER."

28. TIMERBAYEV SAID THAT THE EASTERN SUGGESTION OF " IN NO WAY" WAS BETTER THAN THE ALLIED PROPOSAL AND BROADER IN SCOPE. THE US REP SAID THAT THE ALLIES WERE INTERESTEDIN THE PRINCIPLE OF UNDIMINSHED SECURITY AT ALL POINTS DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS WHILE THE EASTERN SIDE WAS REFERRING ONLY TO AN OUTCOME.

29. AFTER CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND A FURTHER CONSULTATION AMONG EASTERN REPS, THEY PROPOSED THATIT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE TO INCOR-
SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 04527 04 OF 05 311851 Z

PORATE BOTH ALLIED AND EASTERN SUGGESTIONS IN THE FOLLOWING PHRASE: " IN SUCH A WAY THAT THEY WILL TO NO DEGREE AND AT NO POINT BE TO THE DETRIMENT OF THE SECURITY OF ANY OF THE PARTIES." IT WAS AGREED THAT BOTH SIDES WOULD CONSIDER THIS WORDING

WITH THEIR COLLEAGUES.

30. THE UK REP TURNED TO THE 9 TH FOOTNOTE, AN EASTERN RESERVE ON THE SENTENCE, " THIS EXCHANGE OF VIEWS ON AN AGENDA WILL GREATLY FACILITATE THE WORK OF THE FORTHCOMING NEGOTIATIONS." THE EAST SAID IT WAS PREPARED TO DROP ITS RESERVATION ON THE SENTENCE.

31. TURNING TO THE NEXT FOOTNOTE, THE WORD " ALOS" IN THE SENTENCE DESCRIBING THE RIGHT OF PARTICIPANTS TO RAISE SUBJECTS FOR NEGOTIATION, THE UK REP SAID THAT THIS POINT WAS PURELY STYLISTIC AND REMAINED DEPENDENT ON THE POSITION OF THE SENTENCE IN THE TEXT. THE EAST AGREED.

32. THE UK REP THEN NOTED THAT, IN THE MAY 29 DISCUSSION, THE EASTERN SIDE HAD SAID THAT THE QUESTION OF RAISING TOPICS FOR NEGOTIATIONS WOULD BE DECIDED ON THEIR INTRINSIC MERITS WITHOUT EFFORT OT PREVENT THEIR CONSIDERATION ON PROCEDURAL GROUNDS. WERETHE ALLIED REPS CORRECT IN THIS UNDERSTANDING OF THE EASTERN VIEW? IF SO, IT WOULD BE USEFUL TO MAKE THIS VIEW

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04527 05 OF 05 311855 Z

47

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 ADP-00 TRSE-00 CIAE-00 EUR-25 PM-07 INR-10

L-03 NEA-10 NSAE-00 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 GAC-01

USIA-12 SAJ-01 IO-13 OIC-04 AEC-11 ACDA-19 OMB-01

H-02 NSC-10 SS-15 AECE-00 RSR-01 /154 W

----- 090110

P R 311523 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9056

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 529

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

RUCBSAA USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO

S E C R E T SECTION 5 OF 5 VIENNA 4527

DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

PART OF THERECORD IN WRITTEN FORM. KHLESTOV ASKED HOW THE UNDERSTANDING WOULD BE PUT INTO WRITTEN FORM. THE US REP SAID THAT THIS COULD BE DONE THROUGH AN EXCHANGE OF STATEMENTS; FOR EXAMPLE, AT A PLENARY MEETING. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE EASTERN SIDE HAD INDEED SAID WHAT IT HAD SAID AT THE MAY 29 SESSION. AS FOR PUTTING THIS IN WRITTEN FORM, THE EASTERN SIDE WOULD HAVE TO CONSIDER THIS QUESTION FURTHER. AS AN INITIAL REACTION, THE EAST WAS NOT ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT HAVING EVERY POINT OR INTERPRETATION THAT THEY HAD MADE PUT INTO WRITTEN FORM. THE LANGUAGE AS IT STOOD WAS QUITE CLEAR TO ANY PERSON WITH EXPERIENCE IN THE FIELD, BUT HE WOULD CONSIDER THIS QUESTION. THE UK REP NOTED THAT THE SOVIET STATEMENT ON THIS MATTER OF MAY 29 HAD

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04527 05 OF 05 311855 Z

BEEN APPRECIATED BY THE ALLIES AND THAT IT MIGHT BE HELPFUL TO HAVE IT RECORDED IN ENDURING FORM.

33. THE UK REP THEN TURNED TO THE LAST SENTENCE OF THE DRAFT, REFERRING TO QUESTION OF ESTABLISHING WORKING BODIES OR WORKING GROUPS. HE SAID THAT THE ALLIES CONSIDERED BOTH "BODIES" AND "GROUPS" TO BE EQUIVALENT WORDS AND WOULD PREFER TO DROP THE PHRASE "WORKING BODIES." THE WORDING "WORKING GROUPS" WAS CLEARER IN ENGLISH AND REALLY MEANT THE SAME THING. TO USE BOTH PHRASES WOULD BE REDUNDANT.

34. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE ALLIED REPS WERE RAISING NEW PROBLEMS, AND THAT IF THEY WANTED TO START CHANGING THINGS THAT HAD BEEN DISCUSSED WITHOUT DISAGREEMENT IN EARLIER DISCUSSIONS, THE EAST MIGHT BEGIN A SIMILAR PROCESS.

35. THE US REP SAID THAT THE ISSUE WAS ONE OF REDUNDANCY SINCE BOTH WORKING BODIES AND WORKING GROUPS MEANT THE SAME THING. THE UK REP ASKED THE EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES TO CHECK THE LANGUAGE OF THE ORAL ASSURANCES GIVEN BY THE NETHERLANDS AND THE US REPS ON BEHALF OF THE ALLIES IN PREPARING THE MAY 14 PARTICIPATION AND PROCEDURES AGREEMENT, SINCE THIS ASSURANCE USED THE PHRASE "WORKING GROUPS."

36. THE CZECH REP SAID THAT THE EASTERN SIDE WAS PREPARED TO DROP THE TERM "WORKING GROUPS." THE US REP SAID IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE FOR THE ALLIES TO USE THE TERM "WORKING GROUPS" WHILE THE EAST COULD USE "WORKING BODIES" IN THE RUSSIAN TEXT, SINCE THE TERM "WORKING BODIES" SOUNDED STRANGE IN ENGLISH. KHLESTOV SAID THAT THE TERM "WORKING GROUPS" SOUNDED STRANGE IN RUSSIAN. HE ADDED THAT, IN RUSSIAN, THE WORD "BODY" WAS TRANSLATED AS "ORGAN." HE THEN SAID THAT HIS PORTION OF THE TEXT REPRESENTED SOME GOOD WORK WHICH HAD BEEN DONE EARLIER AND THAT IT SHOULD BE LEFT ALONE.

37. DISCUSSION THEN TURNED TO THE DATE FOR THE NEXT PLENARY. EASTERN REPS PRODUCED A DRAFT COMMUNIQUE TEXT STATING THAT THE PLENARY SCHEDULED FOR JUNE 1 WOULD BE POSTPONED. THE UK REP

SAID THAT FRIDAY, JUNE, SEEMED TO BE AN APPROPRIATE DATE AND A PLENARY SHOULD BE HELD THEN. MOVCHAN SAID THERE WAS NOT MUCH THAT COULD BE DISCUSSED IN A PLENARY ON THAT DATE. CZECH REP (LAHODA) SAID THAT THE AUSTRIANS WOULD IN ANY CASE REQUIRE SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04527 05 OF 05 311855 Z

48 HOURS NOTICE AND THAT HE DID NOT CONSIDER THAT THERE WAS ANYTHING TO BE SAID IN A PLENARY ON JUNE 1.

38. THE ALLIES REPS SAID THAT NONETHELESS, IT SEEMED TO THE ALLIES A GOOD IDEA TO HAVE A PLENARY ON JUNE 1. A PLENARY FOR THE WEEK OF MAY 28- JUNE 1 HAD BEEN PUBLICALLY ANNOUNCED THE WEEK BEFORE, IT WOULD LEAD TO QUESTIONS FROM THE PRESS IF IT WERENOT HELD, AND A NUMBER OF DELEGATIONS FROM BOTH SIDES WERE INTERESTED IN A PLENARY MEETING. WHILE THERE MIGHT NOT BE MUCH WORK FOR SUCH A PLENARY, THE MEETING COULD IN ANY CASE BE A RELATIVELY SHORT ONE.

39. LAHODA SAID THAT IF THE PLENARY WERE DEVOTED TO THE SUBJECT OF AGENDA, IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO HOLD ONE. OTHERWISE, THERE WAS NOTHING TO TALK ABOUT, AND IF THEREWERE NO SPEAKERS AT SUCH A PLENARY, THERE WOULD BE REAL PROBLEMS IN EXPLAINING THIS TO THE PRESS. KHLESTOV AGREED WITH THE CZECH REP.

40. THE UK RP THEN ASKED WHAT, AGAINST THIS BACKGROUND, WAS THE EASTERN THINKING ON WHEN HE NEXT PLENARY MEETING SHOULD BE HELD. LAHODA SAID THAT, IF THE PLENARIES WERE HELD NEXT WEEK, IT MIGHT BE USEFUL TO HAVE MORE THANONE. IF THEY WEREHELD THIS WEEK, HOWEVER, THEY SHOULD BE DEVOTED TO THE SUBJECT OF AGENDA EXCLUSIVELY. MOVCHAN SAID THAT IF WESTERNREPS REALLY WANTED A PLENARY HELD ON FRIDAY, JUNE 1, IT MIGHT BE POSSIBLE FOR THE CHAIRMAN MERELY TO INFORM THE PARTICIPANTS IN A NEUTRAL WAY THAT SOME DISCUSSIONS HAD TAKEN PLACE ON A BILATERAL BASIS ON THE AGENDA, THAT THERE HAD BEENUSEFUL EXCHANGES OF VIEWPOINTS, AND THAT WORK WAS CONTINUING. EVEN THIS, HOWEVER, WOULD POSE TECHNICAL PROBLEMS SINCE AN AGREED TEXT WOULD HAVE TO BE PREPARED IN ADVANCE. IN ANY EVENT, THE SUBJECT MATTER WOULD HAVE TO BE LIMITED SOLELY AND EXPLICITLY TO AGENDA.

41. THE UK REP SAID THAT THE EASTERN SIDE SEEMED STRONGLY OF THE OPINION THAT IF ANY PLENARY WERE HELD ON JUNE 1, IT SHOULD BE SOLELY ON THE SUBJECT OF AGENDA. BUT ALLIED REPS MIGHT NOT AGREE AND MIGHT WISHT O RAISE OTHER TOPICS. MOVCHAN SAID THAT, IN THIS CASE, THE EASTERN SIDE WOULD IMMEDIATELY RAISE A POINT OF ORDER AND GO INTO PROCEDURAL DEBATE TO OPPOSE ANY SUCH INTERVENTIONS, ADDING THAT, IN THE EASTERN VIEW, IT WOULD BE BETTER TO HAVE NO PLENARY JUNE1. THE ALLIED REPS SAID THAT THEY SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 04527 05 OF 05 311855 Z

WOULD REPORT EASTERN VIEWS ON THIS MATTER TO THEIR COLLEAGUES.

42. THE NEXT DISCUSSION WAS SCHEDULED FOR AFTERNOON OF MAY 31.
HUMES

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 10 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MBFR
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 31 MAY 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973VIENNA04527
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730560/abqcelmg.tel
Line Count: 708
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION MBF
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 13
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 07 SEP 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <07-Sep-2001 by cunninfx>; APPROVED <29-Oct-2001 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> mcm 980306
Subject: DISCUSSION WITH SOVIET AND CZECHOSLOVAKIAN REPS MAY 30, 1973
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE INFO SECDEF
MBFR CAPITALS
GENEVA
USNMR SHAPE
RUCBSAA
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH

SALT TWO

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005